UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,505	02/05/2001	Yevgeniy Shteyn	US018008	8371

7590	07/22/2004	**EXAMINER**

HOSSAIN, TANIM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	7

Corporate Patent Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corporation
580 White Plains Road
Tarrytown, NY 10591

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-18_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-18_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _12_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _2/05/2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _6_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

    a. On page 8, line 13; "of" is a typographical error which should be changed to "or".

    b. On page 11, line 13; the discussion of Path 2 following steps 401, 402, etc., is incorrect, as step 404 does not logically follow the requirements of Path 2, as described in figure 4. The discussion should be corrected to read: "{401, 402, 403, 407, 411, 413}". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities:

    a. "The method of Claims 1" renders the claim ambiguous.

    Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, and 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Goren-Bar (International publication WO00/08556).

As per claims 1 and 17, Goren-Bar teaches a method and a computer readable storage medium for storing instructions for carrying out a method of customizing a decision-tree based control process (page 4, lines 5-6; wherein the drawing of inferences from user information implies the use of a decision tree for the purpose of control, where certain information controls the inferences made.) that enables access to a data processing system from one of a plurality of clients (page 3, lines 21-24; where multiple computers are discussed, which implies a plurality of clients.), the method comprising: defining the decision-tree based control process, the decision tree being comprised of inter-linked decision nodes (page 3, lines 7-9; wherein the collection of "information to compute the probability of alternative user's intentions and goals or informational needs and changes the given assistance based on user competence" implies the use of inter-linked decision nodes, where distinct information collected leads to different paths in the decision nodes, which, in this case, is the given assistance.); retrieving user-information associated with a user seeking access to the system (page 4, lines 21-22); determining, from the user information, a user entry decision-node (page 5, lines 1-5; wherein the building of the user model is the entry decision-node; and configuring the control process to enable the user to access the system from the client at the user entry decision node (page 5, lines 6-14; wherein the adaptation level is the control configuration.).

As per claim 2, Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising identifying the user (page 10, line 20. Also see figures 15C and D, where the user is identified by name.)

As per claim 3, Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the user selects the user entry decision-node (page 11, lines 12-13; wherein if the user refuses to answer questions, default values are loaded, thus giving the user freedom to choose the entry decision-node).

As per claim 6, Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising enabling the user to go from the entry decision-node to a preceding decision-node (page 12, lines 7-9; wherein a lower level in the hierarchy signifies the preceding decision-node).

As per claim 7, Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the user-information is retrieved from the system (page 10, lines 20-21; wherein the user information is retrieved by supplying a user-name and password.)

As per claim 9, Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the user supplies the user-information (page 4, lines 21-22).

As per claim 10, Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the user-information is based on the past behavior of the user (page 5, lines 19-22).

As per claim 11, Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein a decision node is associated with voice prompts (page 10, line 22).

As per claim 12, Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein a decision node is associated with a displayed element (page 10, line 4).

As per claim 13, Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising displaying a graphical user interface associated with the user entry decision-node (page 7, lines 18-22); and customizing the graphical user interface from the user-information (page 20, lines 1-10).

As per claim 14, Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 13, further comprising enabling the user to customize the graphical user interface (page 22, lines 11-14).

As per claims 15 and 18, Goren-Bar teaches a data processing system, and a device for accessing a data processing system, comprising a client (page 7, line 26); a control process unit to execute a decision-tree based control process that enables access to the system from the client, the decision-tree being comprised of inter-linked decision nodes (figure 1, where the control process is governed by the task and user databases); a customization unit coupled to the control process unit to determine a user entry decision-node from user-information associated with a user seeking access to the system, and to configure the control process to enable the user to access the system from the client at the user entry decision-node (figure 1, where the dialog manager is the customization unit that manages the entry-points).

As per claim 16, Goren-Bar teaches the system of claim 15, further comprising a memory unit for storing the user-information (page 25, line 3; where the storing of information necessitates the existence of a memory unit).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren-Bar in view of Macro Express 2000 Press Release. Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 4, but does not specifically teach the execution of a security process suspending the customization of the control process. The press release specifically teaches executing a security process for temporarily

interrupting the customization of the control process (page 1, lines 36-42). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a security feature

that interrupts the customization of a control process, as taught by Macro Express 2000 in the

system of Goren-Bar, as they are both from the same field of invention, namely the

customization of a computer interface to make it more user-specific and efficient.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren-Bar in view

of Handel et al (International publication WO00/28413). Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim

4, but does not explicitly teach the dependency of the user entry decision node based on the

location and physical environment of the client. Handel teaches the method of claim 1, further

comprising determining the user entry decision-node on the basis of a physical environment of

the client (page 37, lines 10-24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to include the possibility of having the user's physical environment as a

basis for an entry decision node, as taught by Handel in the system of Goren-Bar, as they are

both from the same field of invention, namely the customization of a computer interface to make

it more convenient to the user.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren-Bar in view

of Kerr (European Patent Application, 0 367 709). Goren-Bar teaches the method of claim 8, but

does not explicitly teach the retrieval of user-information from another party. Kerr teaches the

method of claim 1, wherein the user-information is retrieved from another party (column 2, lines

49-54; where the system administrator is enabled to select a range of operations tailored

specifically to the user's information to create a customized interface, which necessitates the

system administrator's retrieval of the user's information). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the capability of allowing another

party to retrieve the user's information, as taught by Kerr, in the system of Goren-Bar, as they

are both from the same field of invention, which is the customization of a computer interface

tailored to the needs of specific users.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 703/605-1228. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 703/305-4003. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703/872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tanim Hossain
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2141

th

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER